THE
Dan Smoot Report

Vol. 14, No. 45 (Broadcast 689) November 4, 1968 Dallas, Texas

DAN SMOOT

WE DO HAVE A CHOICE

Hubert Humphrey is opposed to right-to-work laws. In fact, Humphrey's Democrat platform adopts every proposal desired by monopolistic union bosses.

The labor proposals of the Wallace and Nixon platforms are practically identical. Both endorse, among other things, federal minimum-wage laws; and both are silent on state right-to-work laws.

Richard Nixon is said to approve state right-to-work laws; George Wallace is reported to be against them. The report on Wallace is false. Wallace opposes a *national* right-to-work law, on the grounds that the federal government has no authority in this field, but says states have, and should retain, authority to enact right-to-work laws.

Nixonites say Wallace is not really a conservative, but is a "populist"—which means that he promises welfare-state measures pleasing to people who want the federal government to give them something. Nixonites conveniently overlook the fact that Nixon is even more of a "populist" than Wallace. On social security, and on a variety of federal-aid programs for states, cities, small businesses, farmers, and unemployed—the Nixon, Wallace, and Humphrey platforms are virtually identical.

Humphrey is a dedicated socialist who believes in an all-powerful, centralized government. Nixon faces both ways. He would expand socialism, renaming specific programs, altering their methods of operation, and calling his alterations the "free enterprise way."

Wallace accepts existing socialist programs as a political pragmatist. In his platform, Wallace says:

"The Founding Fathers . . . visualized the tyranny and despotism which would inevitably result from an omnipotent central government; and they sought to avoid that peril by delegating to that . . . federal government only those powers which could best be administered by a central . . . government . . . . And then they provided, in Article X of the Bill of Rights, the Tenth Amendment

THE DAN SMOOT REPORT is published weekly by The Dan Smoot Report, Inc., Box 9538, Dallas, Texas 75214 (office at 6441 Gaston Ave.). Subscriptions: $18.00 for 2 years; $10.00, 1 year; $6.00, 6 months. Dan Smoot was born in Missouri, reared in Texas. With BA and MA degrees from SMU (1938 and 1940), he joined the Harvard faculty (1941) as a Teaching Fellow, doing graduate work in American civilization. From 1942 to 1951, he was an FBI agent; from 1951 to 1955, a commentator on national radio and television. In 1955, he started his present independent, free-enterprise business: publishing this REPORT and abbreviating it each week for radio and TV broadcasts available for commercial sponsorship by business firms.

Copyright by Dan Smoot, 1968. Second Class mail privilege authorized at Dallas, Texas.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to the Constitution of the United States, that: 'The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people.'"

In a speech at Dallas on September 16, 1968, Wallace said:

"When I am President, I will do everything within my power to restore the full effect and meaning of the Tenth Amendment to our Constitution."

In these statements, Wallace expresses the essence of American constitutional government. Yet, his support of federal-aid programs is a direct violation of constitutional principles.

On September 16, I asked Wallace how he justifies his stand on federal aid. Here is what he said:

The Constitution does not authorize federal aid to states or individuals, but we already have federal aid. We are not talking about whether to start federal aid programs. I would be against that.

The way it is now, the federal government is taking so much money out of the states that they would be ruined if they did not get part of the money back. We would be much better off if all federal aid programs were eliminated and federal taxes reduced accordingly, so that the taxpayers' money would be left in the communities and states to finance programs that the people want.

If I am elected, I would hope that by de-emphasizing federal activity in all these fields and encouraging state and private activity, we could gradually eliminate the unconstitutional federal programs without hurting a lot of people that now depend on the money from Washington.

But no politician could be elected to high office—not even to the governorship of a state—who talked about suddenly stopping all federal aid. And unless we can get men elected who know these federal programs are wrong, and know these responsibilities and revenues should be left with the states and local communities, we will never have a chance to work for a return to the kind of states-rights, constitutional government we are supposed to have.

In the meantime—as long as the federal government is taking money out of the states for federal aid programs—the tax money which states and communities get back from Washington should not come with administrative guidelines attached by sociologists and theoreticians in the federal agencies.

When I am President, I will see to it that such administrative guidelines are eliminated; and I will save taxpayers a lot of money by getting rid of high-salaried federal officials who spend their time and our money dictating to the states and communities and the people of our country how to run their schools, their hospitals, their unions, their businesses, and their private lives.

At one point in his official platform, Wallace does hold out this promise of phasing out unconstitutional federal aid and intervention. With regard to federal agricultural programs, the Wallace platform says:

"We will work toward gradual relaxation and elimination of farm regulation and control with a concurrent reduction in required subsidization as farm income increases, the eventual goal being the elimination of both controls and the need for subsidy, such program being contingent upon the increase in farm income to a level making subsidy unnecessary."

Wallace is the only major presidential candidate ever to promise not to subordinate the interest of the United States to the interest of any international organization.

Wallace's platform castigates U Thant (Secretary General of the UN) for taking sides against the U.S. with regard to the Vietnam war. Wallace's platform promises to treat Rhodesia and South Africa as friendly nations, and to reject economic sanctions against Rhodesia—sanctions ordered by the UN and imposed by the Johnson-Humphrey administration.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Wallace's platform says:

"We will not abandon the United Nations Organization unless it first abandons us. It should be given fair opportunity at resolving international disputes, however, we will not subordinate the interest of our nation to the interest of any international organization . . . . [UN] members should bear proportionate share of the cost of operation and we will insist on financial responsibility on the part of the member nations. We also feel that . . . [UN] officials . . . must conduct themselves with . . . objectivity and impartiality, and we will so insist. We will give this organization [UN] opportunity to succeed in its purpose but should it fail, we will reappraise our relationship with it."

The UN has already been given "fair opportunity at resolving international disputes," and it has failed miserably. It can never succeed in its avowed purpose of saving the world from the scourge of war, but will remain a malignant growth inside the United States, providing cover for worldwide Soviet espionage, vitiating U.S. resolve to the extent that our government will not adopt a foreign policy designed to protect the national interests of the United States. In reappraising our relationship with the UN (as Wallace promises), there is only one logical course to follow: get the U.S. out of the UN and the UN out of the U.S.

Both Richard Nixon and Hubert Humphrey (UN worshippers ever since the UN was created) give full, unqualified endorsement of the UN.

Humphrey's Democrat platform says:

"Our dedication to its [UN's] purpose and its work remains undiminished . . . . The agencies of the United Nations . . . . deserve continued and expanded support. We pledge that support . . . ."

Nixon's Republican platform says:

"We will seek to develop law among nations and strengthen agencies to effectuate that law and cooperatively solve common problems. We will assist the United Nations to become the keystone of such agencies . . . ."

This is the same internationalism that has been the keystone of our foreign policy since the 1940's when the United Nations was founded. This bipartisan foreign policy has dragged our nation to the very edge of disaster.

Nixon and Humphrey are self-styled internationalists who are both publicly committed to a program of surrendering American national independence in order to take the United States into some form of world government. George Wallace believes strongly in nationalism and absolute American independence.

If Hubert Humphrey were President, monopolistic union bosses (Walter Reuther, George Meany, *et al.*), pro-communist peaceniks, and black militants (like James Brown, to whom Humphrey has made specific promises) would be the principal formulators of national policy. Richard Nixon, if President, would choose for advisers, for members of his cabinet, and for appointments to the Supreme Court, men like Nelson Rockefeller, George Romney, William Scranton, and Charles S. Rhyne (an internationalist, former President of the American Bar Association, passionate foe of the Connally Reservation, and now one of Nixon's principal advisers). Wallace is receiving the support of many who are not real conservatives; but the leadership of the Wallace movement comes from the hard core of American constitutional conservatives. Wallace is thus irrevocably tied to the conservatives, and they would represent the dominant influence in his administration.

Both Nixon and Humphrey support Johnson's mishandling of the Vietnam war, and *both* have publicly endorsed Johnson's offer of a billion-dollar bribe to the North Vietnamese communists. Nixon, for example, has said he favors offering aid to North Vietnam after the war, if the communists will end their aggression. Nixon—who is supposed to know a lot about communists and how to deal with them—obviously has not learned that when you appease or bribe communists, you

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

merely convince them that you are weak and afraid and thus encourage them to more aggression.

Wallace is the only presidential candidate who offers hope of saving thousands of American lives in the present conflict and preventing future American involvement in wars with communists —by getting us out of the Vietnam war, quickly and victoriously.

Wallace is the only presidential candidate who offers sensible proposals on the critical issue of law and order.

Nixon promises to establish a national academy for training police, and a national clearing house for ideas and information on law enforcement. The FBI has been ably providing these services for many years. Both Nixon and Humphrey suggest more federal aid to local police, but federal aid is unconstitutional. It will bring federal controls, and eventually a federal police. Both Nixon and Humphrey (while decrying violence and saying it will not be tolerated) tacitly excuse raging mob violence by promising vast additional federal expenditures to "eliminate the causes of riots."

Wallace says poverty is no excuse or valid cause for rioting. He does not promise to bribe rioters not to riot. He does not promise unconstitutional federal aid for police. He promises to give the moral support of the presidency to law enforcement agencies in the impartial enforcement of existing laws. Wallace promises to act, wherever and whenever the President has constitutional authority to act, to set an example of law enforcement. He promises to urge legislation to nullify Supreme Court decisions that have handicapped legitimate law enforcement; and he supports a constitutional amendment that would make the tenure of Supreme Court justices subject to periodic review by Congress. He also strongly supports the right of law-abiding citizens to keep and bear arms.

In short, Wallace is the only presidential candidate who offers change from the present disastrous course of our domestic and foreign policies—who holds out some hope of restoring American constitutional government at home and of directing defense and foreign policies to emphasize first and foremost the security and independence of the United States.

Wallace can win. His victory would be a certainty if all conservatives, who have opposed almost everything Richard Nixon has stood for during the past 16 years, would objectively face facts. Nixon, though craftily wooing conservative political support, is still an avowed internationalist liberal, just as Hubert Humphrey is.

Do not listen to the nonsense that you will be wasting your vote if you vote for George Wallace, because "Wallace *cannot* win." An American election is supposed to be above the level of a horse race, and is supposed to be above the level of elections in communist countries where only the "winners" are put on the ballot. An American voter should vote for the candidate of his choice —without regard to who is the choice of the pollsters, or of the Las Vegas odds-makers, or of the existing power-establishment.

George Wallace—with whatever imperfections there may be in his conservative stance—offers conservatives the most hopeful political opportunity we have had in a full generation. We had better take it.

SUBSCRIBE TO THE DAN SMOOT REPORT:
6 mo. — $6.00; 1 yr. — $10.00; 2 yrs. — $18.00

Please notify us of any change of address *before* you move. With increased postal rates, we no longer can afford to remail issues returned by the Post Office.

REPRINTS OF THIS ISSUE
(for bulk mailing to one address):

1 copy	$ .25	100 copies	$ 6.50
10 copies	1.00	200 copies	12.00
25 copies	2.00	500 copies	28.00
50 copies	3.50	1000 copies	50.00

Texans Add 4% for Sales Tax
(Add 50¢ for special-handling postage)
THE DAN SMOOT REPORT TAylor 1-2303
BOX 9538 DALLAS, TEXAS 75214

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED